



AF
Image

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **CHIKAZAWA, Nagahisa et al.**

Group Art Unit: **2623**

Serial Number: **09/811,526**

Examiner: **LAROSE, Colin M**

Filed: **March 20, 2001**

Confirmation No.: **9425**

For: **FINGERPRINT RECOGNIZING APPARATUS AND INFORMATION
PROCESSING UNIT HAVING SUCH APPARATUS**

Customer No. **38834**

Atty. Docket No. **010363**

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop: AF

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

April 22, 2005

Applicants respond herein to the January 25, 2005 Office Action.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bradney et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,208,264) in view of Setlak et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,940,526).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons provided below.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on two prior art references, MPEP § 2143 requires that: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; and (2) the modified prior art must teach or suggest all claim limitations. Applicants explain as follows why neither requirement has been met.

The rejection relies on Bradney et al. as the primary reference and on Setlak et al. as the secondary reference. More specifically, the rejection relies on Setlak et al. to suggest modifying the disclosed technology of Bradney et al. to have every element recited in the claims. As explained in applicants' July 30, 2004 submission, beginning on page 10, Bradney et al.